

wood oil of pharmacopoeial standard. The remaining lot was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Sandalwood Oil U. S. P. Pure East India," was false and misleading since it represented that the article was a volatile oil distilled with steam from the dried heartwood of *Santalum album* Linné, whereas it was not as represented since it contained benzyl alcohol, a derivative of phthalic acid and terpineol; and in that it was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the name of another article, namely, sandalwood oil.

On July 22, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

29275. Adulteration and misbranding of Lactium. U. S. v. 6 Cans and 8 Jars of Lactium (and 1 other seizure action). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 42950, 43022. Sample Nos. 18214-D, 18249-D.)

This product was represented to be a concentrated culture of acidophilus bacilli. Examination showed that it contained insufficient viable acidophilus bacilli to be of any therapeutic importance; that it was contaminated with yeast and that its labeling bore false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims.

On June 18 and July 6, 1938, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of a total of 6 cans and 55 jars of Lactium at San Francisco, Calif.; alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 7 and June 7, 1938, from Chicago, Ill., by Scientific Health Laboratories; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Samples taken from the two shipments were found to contain 20,000 and 100,000 viable organisms per gram, respectively, and to be contaminated with yeast.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, namely, "Concentrated Lactic Culture * * * Bacillus Acidophilus Guaranteed Viable Full Year 1938," since the article contained an inconsequential number of viable organisms.

Misbranding was alleged in that the statements on the labels, "Concentrated Lactic Culture One Teaspoonful in milk or water with meals three times daily," and "Bacillus Acidophilus Guaranteed Viable Full Year," were false and misleading since the article was not concentrated lactic culture, it contained an inconsequential number of bacillus acidophilus, and it was not viable a full year. Misbranding was alleged further in that the statements on the label, "Step Up Health" and "Regain Normal Intestinal Flora," falsely and fraudulently represented the curative and therapeutic effectiveness of the article.

On July 14 and August 29, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

29276. Adulteration and misbranding of Gauztex. U. S. v. 79 Packages of Gauze Bandages. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 42952. Sample No. 27233-D.)

This product was represented to be sterile but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

On June 20, 1938, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 79 packages of gauze bandages at Denver, Colo., consigned by General Bandages, Inc.; alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 18, 1938, from Chicago, Ill.; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, namely, the statement in the labeling, "Gauztex is sterilized," since it was not sterile but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

Misbranding was alleged in that the following statements, appearing variously in the labeling, were false and misleading since they represented that the article had the characteristics set forth in the statements; whereas the drug